UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,895	12/27/2000	Yueheng Xu	INTL-0403-US(P8986)	5241

7590	10/21/2005

Timothy N. Trop
TROP PRUNER & HU, P.C.
STE 100
8554 KATY FWY
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, CHAU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2176	

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/748,895	XU, YUEHENG
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chau Nguyen	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 August 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 11-17, 21-24 and 26-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 11-17, 21-24 and 26-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Amendment received on 08/02/2005, has been entered. Claims 1-7, 11-17, 21-

24, and 26-32.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-17, 21, 23-24, and 26-32 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, Patent No. 6,157,905, Taieb, Patent

No. 6,718,519, and further in view of Rojas et al. (Rojas), Patent No. 6,425,123.

4.   As to claims 1, 11 and 21, Powell discloses a method comprising:

receiving a file including characters (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14 and Fig.

6:receiving an input digital document and identify the character set and language of the

digital document);

converting the characters of said file to a first code format if the characters are of

a first type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in

a Latin-based byte character set, then generate a three-dimensional characterization

(first code format) of the digital document using Table 1; and

converting the characters of said file to a second code format having a multiple

double byte length if said characters are of a second type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line

14: if the digital document representation is in a multiple byte character set, then

generate a two-dimensional characterization (second code) using the mapping in Table

4).

However, Powell does not explicitly disclose displaying the characters of the file

using the first code format or the second code format. In the same field of endeavor,

Taieb discloses a multilingual text file is decomposed into segments, the invention looks

up the preloaded list of system fonts to select the appropriate font (format) for each

segments, and then the entire text is displayed with appropriate font for each segment

(Fig. 7 and col. 7, line 47 – col. 8, line 51). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of

Taieb and Powell to include displaying characters of the file using the first code format

or the second code format in order to solve fundamental problem when trying to

accommodate multilingual output.

However, Powell and Taieb do not explicitly disclose the first code format having

a double-byte length. In the same field of endeavor, Rojas discloses translation of

single-byte languages into a double-byte character set (first code format) (Abstract, Fig.

8, col. 2, line 48 – col. 3, line 21 and col. 10, lines 23-43). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the

teachings of Rojas and Powell and Taieb to include first code format having a double-

byte length to create double-wide characters, and the double-wide characters increase

the spacing, i.e., field length, typically needed for translation of the text into a different

language.

5.   As to claims 3 and 13, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose checking to determine

whether a character set plane is changed (Powell, col. 13, line 38 – col. 15, line 2:

detecting the characters/language of the segment of the digital document to be the

single language script range).

6.   As to claims 4 and 14, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if the character set

plane is changed, inserting a new character set designator (Powell, col. 13, line 38 –

col. 15, line 2 and col. 15, line 47 – col. 16, line 18: if the characters/language of the

segment of the digital is not single language script range, then it must be a multiple

language script range, and assign source code value to a unique target value

(character)).

7.   As to claims 5 and 15, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose determining whether the

characters in the file are defined according to the first code format (Powell, col. 11, line

43 – col. 12, line 55: detecting the characters in the digital document means determines

whether the digital document is expressed in a Latin-based single byte character (first code format)).

8.   As to claims 6, 16 and 23, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if said characters are coded according to said first code format, table mapping Unicode values to said first code format (Powell, col. 14, lines 15-38 and Table 5).

9.   As to claims 7, 17 and 24, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein if said first code format is not utilized, using the surrogate area of Unicode (Powell, col. 14, line 40 – col. 15, line 2 and Table 5).

10.   As to claims 26, 29, and 32, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose converting the characters to the first code format or the second code format before parsing a web page including the characters (Taieb, col. 3, line 29 – col. 4, line 38).

11.   As to claims 27 and 30, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose wherein displaying the characters comprises converting each converted character into an encoding and indexing into a font file using the encoding to obtain the character (Powell, col. 13, line 59 – col. 15, line 47).

12.   As to claim 28, Powell-Taieb-Rojas wherein the second code format accommodates at least 100,000 characters (Powell, col. 7, lines 6-37).

13.   As to claim 31, Powell-Taieb-Rojas storing instructions that if executed enable the processor-based system to use the encoding to access the font file for the characters of the second type arranged in a row and column format (Taieb, Fig. 3: the motivation of Taieb's system is to identify the language or character set being used in the data so that a best match to available output fonts may be made).

14.   Claims 2, 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, Taieb, and Rojas as applied to claims 1, 3-7, 11, 13-17, 21, 23-24 and 26-32 above, and further in view of Lincke et al. (Lincke), Patent No. 6,397,259.

15.   As to claims 2, 12 and 22, Powell-Taieb-Rojas disclose receiving a digital document (web page) in a plane and row format (Powell, col. 13, lines 4-15: digital document representation into segments (rows)). However, Powell does not explicitly disclose a web in a plane, row and column format. Lincke discloses web pages includes graphic, text, frame, tables (columns and rows), form, etc... (col. 3, lines 6-33 and col. 21, line 65 – col. 22, line 8). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Lincke and Powell-Taieb-Rojas to include a web page in a plane, row and column format in order to provide user friendly environment for web users.

Response to Arguments

In the remarks, Applicant(s) argued in substance that

A) Nowhere does Powell teach or suggest converting characters to a first code format having a double-byte length if the characters are of a first type and converting characters to a second code format having a multiple double-type length if the characters are of a second type.

As to point A, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Examiner's used Powell and Rojas references to reject "converting characters to a first code format having a double-byte length if the characters are of a first type and converting characters to a second code format having a multiple double-type length if the characters are of a second type".

Powell discloses converting the characters of said file to a first code format if the characters are of a first type (col. 1, lines 11-34 that digital document representations are stored in a computer system as a series of values called bytes, and text is converted to these byte values using a "character set". Also, Powell discloses in col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a Latin-based

byte character set, then generate (convert) a three-dimensional characterization (first code format) of the digital document using Table 1; and converting the characters of said file to a second code format having a multiple double byte length if said characters are of a second type (col. 11, line 43 – col. 12, line 14: if the digital document representation is in a multiple byte character set, then generate (convert) a two-dimensional characterization (second code) using the mapping in Table 4).

Rojas discloses translation (conversion) of single-byte languages into a double-byte character set (first code format, which having a double-byte character) (Abstract, Fig. 8, col. 2, line 48 – col. 3, line 21 and col. 10, lines 23-43).

B) Rojas no where teaches or suggests converting characters to a different code formats having different byte length based on a character type.

As to point B, this argument is similar to argument A. Examiner's rejected this limitation based on two references which are Powell and Rojas, therefore, Applicant(s) cannot argued this limitation based on just one Rojas reference. Please see response to argument A above.

C) There is no motivation to combine Powell and Taieb.

As to point C, in response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Powell discloses generating or converting digital document to either two-dimensional characterization or three-dimensional characterization based on character type of the digital document, which is similar to evaluating each character of the message to create the best matching font to output the text of Taieb, thus Powell and Taieb are analogous art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Powell reference and Taieb reference together. The motivation for doing so is to solve fundamental problem when trying to accommodate multilingual output.

D) Taieb nowhere teaches or suggests use of conversion of characters to different code formats based on a type of the character.

As to point D, Examiner does not use Taieb to reject "conversion of characters to different code formats based on a type of the character" limitation.   Therefore, Applicant(s) cannot argue this limitation based on Taieb reference.

E) The prima facie case of obviousness has not been established.

As to point D, to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there basic criteria

must be met.

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references

themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to

modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. In this case, Powell discloses

generating or converting digital document to either two-dimensional characterization or

three-dimensional characterization based on character type of the digital document,

which is similar to evaluating each character of the message to create the best

matching font to output the text of Taieb, thus Powell and Taieb are analogous art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to combine Powell reference and Taieb reference together. The

motivation for doing so is to solve fundamental problem when trying to accommodate

multilingual output.

Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. The prior art can

be modified or combined to reject claims as prima facie obvious as long as there is a

reasonable expectation of success. In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ

375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, claimed invention directed to a method of converting

the characters of a file to different format was rejected as obvious over Powell

reference, which taught generating or converting digital document to either two-

dimensional characterization or three-dimensional characterization based on character

type of the digital document, and further in view of Rojas reference, which taught using

multibyte transliteration to create double-wide characters. Thus, there was reasonable expectation that a process combining the prior art steps could be successfully scaled up.

Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In this case, please see the rejection of claim 1 and response to argument in points A-D above.

16.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/02/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Please see the rejection and response to arguments above.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.   Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action.   In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action.   In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Chau Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4092. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am – 5:30 pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (571) 272-4136.   The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.   On July 15, 2005, the Central Facsimile (FAX) Number will change from

703-872-9306 to 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chau Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176

WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/17/2005